

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN**

---

**PERRAULT JEAN-PAUL,  
Plaintiff,**

**v.**

**Case No. 13-C-1445**

**CITY OF MILWAUKEE, et al.,  
Defendants.**

---

**DECISION AND ORDER**

Perrault Jean-Paul, a New Jersey resident who is proceeding pro se, has filed a document which the Clerk of Court has docketed as a complaint against the City of Milwaukee. He alleges that a City ordinance is unconstitutional on its face and that the City is poised to raze certain properties owned by him pursuant to this ordinance. Along with his complaint, Jean-Paul filed a motion for a temporary restraining order pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 65(b), seeking an order temporarily preventing the City from razing his properties.

The motion for a temporary restraining order is denied. First, the plaintiff has not satisfied the prerequisite to obtaining a temporary restraining order of certifying in writing the efforts he made to give notice to the City and the reasons why it should not be required. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 65(b)(1)(B). The plaintiff has not explained why he did not have a process server effect service of the complaint and his motion on the City of Milwaukee as soon as he filed those papers with the court, which he did on December 27, 2013. Had he completed service immediately upon filing the complaint and his motion, the City would

have been required to file responses to both by now, and ex parte relief would not be needed.

Second, the plaintiff has not satisfied the prerequisite to obtaining a temporary restraining order of demonstrating that he will suffer irreparable harm if a restraining order is not granted. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 65(b)(1)(A). The only harm that will come to pass if the plaintiff's motion is not granted is economic: the plaintiff will lose the value of the properties that are razed. The plaintiff does not live in the properties but instead purchased them as investments. The plaintiff does not give any reason why an award of damages at the end of this case would not repair the economic harm caused by the razing of his properties.

Accordingly, **IT IS ORDERED** that plaintiff's motion for a temporary restraining order is **DENIED**.

Dated at Milwaukee, Wisconsin, this 13th day of February 2014.

s/ Lynn Adelman

---

LYNN ADELMAN  
District Judge